

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8 and 10-15 are pending in the present application, Claim 4 having been amended, Claims 1-3, 5-7, 10, and 12-15 having been withdrawn, and Claim 9 having been previously canceled. Support for the amendment to Claim 4 is found in the specification, for example, at page 15, line 25 – page 16, line 1. Thus no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 4, 8, and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Ito et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,748,179, hereinafter Ito) in view of Sukegawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,636,329).

Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment to independent Claim 4 overcomes the outstanding rejection. Amended Claim 4 recites, *inter alia*, “wherein the signal input pad, the IC signal pad, and the inspection pad are covered with a same sheet of anisotropic conductive film.”

In a non-limiting embodiment of the claimed invention, a sheet of an ACF can be deposited to cover the signal input pad, the IC signal pad, and the inspection pad. By covering the input pad, the IC signal pad, and the inspection pad at the same time, an additional step of depositing an ACF is eliminated.¹

Ito does not describe or suggest that a signal input pad, an IC signal pad, and an inspection pad are covered with a same sheet of anisotropic film. As shown in Figs. 14 and 15 of Ito, input wires Td are covered with anisotropic conductive film ACF 1, and bump BMP connected to the driving IC is covered with anisotropic conductive film ACF 2. ACF 1 is different than ACF 2, and ACF 1 and ACF 2 are attached separately.² Thus, Ito does not

¹ See, Specification, page 15-16.

² Ito, col. 12, lines 11-16.

describe or suggest covering an IC signal pad, an inspection pad, and a signal input pad with a same sheet of anisotropic conductive film.

Sukegawa does not cure the above-noted deficiency in Ito. Sukegawa was only cited to describe that an anisotropic conductive film includes a resin. Sukegawa does not describe or suggest the claimed “wherein the signal input pad, the IC signal pad, and the inspection pad are covered with a same sheet of anisotropic conductive film.”

Claim 4 also recites “an IC signal pad formed at a position corresponding to the driver IC on the insulating substrate, and formed to connect the signal line and the driver IC.” The outstanding Office Action states “an IC signal pad *inherently* formed at a position corresponding to the driver IC on the insulating substrate, and formed to connect the signal line and driver IC as Fig. 15 shown” (emphasis added).³

However, the outstanding Office Action provides no rationale as to why Fig. 15 of Ito inherently shows “an IC signal pad formed at a position corresponding to the driver IC on the insulating substrate, and formed to connect the signal line and the driver IC.” As noted by the court in In re Rijckaert, 28 USPQ2d 1955, 1956 (Fed. Cir. 1993), “assumptions do not constitute the disclosure of prior art.” To the extent that the PTO is to continue to argue that Ito teaches this element of Claim 4, it should specifically point out and explain this teaching. See the Rijckaert decision at 28 USPQ2d, 1957, and the court’s statement of the law that “[t]he mere fact that a certain thing *may* result from a given set of circumstances is not sufficient to establish inherency,” and that “when the PTO asserts that there is an explicit or implicit teaching or suggestion in the prior art, it must indicate where such a teaching or suggestion appears in the reference” (emphasis in original) (citations omitted). Because the outstanding Office Action provides no explanation of why Applicants’ claimed features are

³ Office Action, page 4.

Application No. 10/625,511

Reply to Office Action of September 20, 2005


inherent, Applicants submit the rejection is improper (*See* MPEP § 2112, IV “Examiner must provide rationale or evidence tending to show inherency.”)

In view of the above-noted distinctions, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 4 (and Claims 8 and 11) patentably distinguish over Ito and Sukegawa, taken alone or in proper combination.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000

Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Raymond F. Cardillo, Jr.
Registration No. 40,440

GJM/RFC/JW/agm
I:\ATTY\JW\240697US\240697US_AM DUE 12-20-05.DOC